

p. 248) pointed out that, although the specimen designated as the lectotype, which had been suggested to him by Mr J.C. Battersby in the Natural History Museum, London, was registered as from Gould's collection and dated 'Feb. 1837', Gould had not arrived in Australia by that date. Merten's lectotype designation is very probably invalid and there is thus no basis for Böhme's (1991) system of nomenclature.

Contrary to Böhme & Ziegler (their para. 6 above), we firmly believe that the use of stable nomenclature for the inclusion of species and subspecies in CITES and other legislative documentation is important. Taxonomists are the servants of the entire biological world that uses scientific names; we work to serve those needs, not to establish an authority to which everyone must subscribe whether convenient or not. Our own survival depends directly on the respect other biologists have for what we do; their interests — i.e. stability — determine our effectiveness. This seems not always to be adequately appreciated by other taxonomists.

We commend our application to the Commission.

Comment on the proposed suppression of all prior usages of generic and specific names of birds (Aves) by John Gould and others conventionally accepted as published in the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* (Case 3044; see BZN 54: 172–182)

(1) Storrs L. Olson

*Department of Vertebrate Zoology, National Museum of Natural History,
Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*

The application of Schodde & Bock comes as a response to the paper of Bruce & McAllan (1990), who showed that numerous names of birds proposed by John Gould and other ornithologists in monographic works and in the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* (PZS) had appeared earlier in more popular periodicals such as *The Athenaeum*, *The Literary Gazette*, and *The Analyst* (for the sake of brevity I shall refer to these as the 'ancillary' publications, with no intent of impugning their significance to nomenclature). I oppose this application, first of all on the general principle that there should be some reasonable curb to further additions to the gigantic subsidiary literature of suppressed names and works already created by the Commission. Such suppressions should be undertaken only when there is a very real need — when there is truly a threat to communication and understanding in the zoological community. This is definitely not the case with almost all parts of the application of Schodde & Bock, to which I expand my objection on the following points.

1. The application must be viewed in the context of the acrimonious confrontations that have enveloped the nomenclature of Australian vertebrates in recent years, during the course of which Schodde vs. Bruce and McAllan have occupied bitterly opposing camps (e.g. see Olson, 1990). Although Bruce & McAllan (1990) have produced an important contribution to the history and bibliography of Australian ornithology, this is marred by their rather disingenuously making claims of priority for a few names that are certainly *nomina nuda* and a few others that are little better.

This is not true, however, for the majority of names they discussed. The application of Schodde & Bock is plainly reactionary in nature and attempts to suppress everything that Bruce & McAllan (1990) uncovered that bears on nomenclature, regardless of the actual effect on names currently in use. The result is a poorly researched broadside that is likely to create as many problems as it proposes to resolve.

2. In an attempt to prejudice a ruling in their favor, Schodde & Bock have characterized the descriptions in the ancillary publications as 'sketchy and often ambiguous accounts' (para. 3, ii), which is at best exaggeration and at worst egregious dissembly. Bruce & McAllan (1990) reproduced all of these descriptions verbatim so that they may be more readily evaluated. Of the 43 species descriptions that Schodde and Bock wish to have suppressed, I would assess 30 as ranging from spare, but undeniably adequate, to wonderfully detailed (e.g. *Casuarius bennetti*). No fewer than 13 in my estimation are extremely good.

3. In continuing their dissembling, Schodde & Bock (para. 3, iii) portray 'many of the names' as being open 'to interpretation as nomina nuda and argument as to whether they are available,' citing the examples of *Ptiloris victoriae*, *Excalf[a]c[toria minima*, and *Chrysococcyx minutillus*. The last two definitely are nomina nuda where they appear in the ancillary sources, as is also *Meleagris mexicana*, so these citations require no action by the Commission. Discounting the species of *Dinornis* attributed to Owen in the *Literary Gazette* of 1843, which present a separate set of problems, only six or seven of the specific names in contention (not 'many') might be disputed on grounds of equivocal descriptions, such as that of *Ptiloris victoriae* and those that essentially only repeat the specific name in English (e.g. *Odontophorus hyperythrus*, *Podiceps micropterus*, *Chordeiles pusillus*). As noted above, the rest constitute valid descriptions and must be evaluated on their merits.

4. Four of the generic and 39 of the specific citations from the ancillary literature proposed for suppression involve the same name, spelled the same way, by the same author, and used for the same taxon as those names currently in use. Thus they present no threat whatever to existing nomenclature and only require that the citation of the original description be changed. Suppressing the earlier publications actually increases the vulnerability of existing nomenclature to different competing names that may have been published between the first publication of the names in question and their subsequent appearance in publications that Schodde and Bock wish to conserve. In one case (*Anser serrirostris*), the lapse between first appearance in *The Literary Gazette* and subsequent publication in *PZS* was 19 years! Thus, when there is no difference in a name used in two or more publications, stability of nomenclature is actually enhanced by citing the earliest valid appearance of a name.

5. The extent to which names may have been cited in previous literature as dating from the ancillary publications has not received sufficient investigation by Schodde and Bock, who cite only two modern, highly derivative sources. It is certain that the ancillary publications have not always been overlooked. For example, Richmond (1992) discovered the publication of most of the names cited by Bruce & McAllan as dating from *The Athenaeum*. Although not published until the Richmond Index was made available on microfiche in 1992, Richmond corresponded widely with taxonomists with whom he doubtless shared his findings and who may in fact have cited various of the ancillary publications. Wetmore (1965, p. 322), for example, gives the

publication of *Odontophorus veraguensis* Gould in *The Athenaeum* precedence over that in *PZS*. Schodde & Bock note that the citation for *Balaeniceps rex* Gould is now accepted as of its appearance in *The Athenaeum*, and if that journal is of sufficient stature for so singular a bird as *Balaeniceps*, then why should it not be acceptable for others as well?

6. Although Wetmore (1968, p. 507) overlooked the appearance of the name *Aulacorhamphus caeruleogularis* Gould in *The Athenaeum* of 26 February 1853, he gives its publication in *The Zoologist* in April 1853 as the original citation for the species, rather than that in the *PZS* published 24 July 1854. Note that *Aulacorhamphus caeruleogularis* was also described as a 'new species' in *The Annals and Magazine of Natural History* in May 1855, although admittedly as a verbatim reprint of the description from *PZS*. So here we have four different publications containing what may be taken as the original description for the name *Aulacorhamphus caeruleogularis*. How does one decide which has precedence? Is this to be done by determining which of these serials is considered to be the least 'rare and inaccessible' (Schodde & Bock, para. 3, ii) in the 1990s, by the scientific prestige of a given journal in the 1850s, or should this determination in fact be made by the objective criterion of priority, which is supposed to be the cornerstone of the rules of zoological nomenclature?

7. The matter of the name cited above as dating from *The Zoologist* raises yet another issue, which is that Bruce and McAllan's investigations extended only to selected periodicals, whereas earlier citations than those cited for suppression by Schodde & Bock based on Bruce & McAllan certainly exist in other journals. Schodde & Bock (para. 8(1)(b)) propose to circumvent this problem by suppressing 'all uses of the names prior to the publication of the same names given' in their para. 8(2). The business of wholesale suppression of publications is bad enough, but I would particularly deplore its extension to works that have never been explicitly identified.

8. None of the authors involved has correctly resolved the name *Nyctidus pectoralis* published in *The Athenaeum* 18 November 1837, as all failed to note that Gould (1838, pl. xviii & text) shortly thereafter described a species *Nyctibius pectoralis* from northern Brazil. Thus Bruce & McAllan erred in considering the name in *The Athenaeum* to supplant the name now in use for the Haitian *Nyctibius*, as there was no connection in that publication between the drawing Gould exhibited of 'Nyctidus' and specimens that he also exhibited from Turkey and Haiti. Nothing about the name *Nyctidus pectoralis* in *The Athenaeum* requires formal suppression because the name is utterly unidentifiable at that point, the only information given being that its tarsus was 'scarcely a quarter of an inch long.' Had it not specifically been stated to be a bird, even that much would have to be surmised. *Nyctidus* is clearly only a misspelling, but even if it were identifiable it would simply be a junior synonym of *Nyctibius* Vieillot, 1816.

9. The application of Schodde & Bock adds to what is already a vexatious mess regarding certain names of moas (*Dinornis*) described by Owen. Bruce & McAllan (1990, p. 458) claim that the names *Dinornis giganteus*, *D. struthoides*, *D. didiformis*, and *D. otidiformis* should date from *The Literary Gazette* of 2 December 1843 rather than *PZS* March 1844. Neither they nor Schodde & Bock make any mention of the new name *D. dromaeoides*, which also appears in both publications, although any

necessary action concerning the first four species seemingly ought to apply to this one as well. Bruce & McAllan (1990, p. 458) note that the descriptions in *The Literary Gazette* 'although superficial, are no more so than the accounts given in *PZS*'. This considerably misrepresents the case, as in both publications the names are absolute or virtual nomina nuda. Richmond (1992) regarded all the names in *PZS* as nomina nuda. Archey & Allan (1954) likewise regarded *D. struthoides* to be a nomen nudum as of its appearance in *PZS*, although they mistakenly stated that the name *D. ingens* appeared in this publication also. Proper descriptions of these species first appeared in the *Transactions of the Zoological Society* (1844) rather than the *PZS*.

The only species with any claim of dating from either of the publications earlier than the *Transactions* is *Dinornis gigantea*, which was described in *PZS* as having a tibiotarsus 2 feet 11 inches long (2 feet 10 inches long in *The Literary Gazette*) which is perhaps sufficient characterization of the species. This is the only species of the five for which Brodtkorb (1963, p. 217) gives *PZS* as the original citation, all the rest being attributed to the *Transactions*. All of the other species are characterized in *The Literary Gazette* and *PZS* solely by extrapolations of their height relative to each other and to other large birds. These are inferences based on data that are not presented and cannot be considered to be descriptions.

Dinornis struthoides and *D. otidiformis* have already been placed on the Official List, with the *Transactions* cited as place of publication (Opinion 229; Opinion 1874 [not 1876 as in Schodde & Bock]). The application of Schodde & Bock proposes to add *D. giganteus* and *D. didiformis* to the Official List but as of their appearance in *PZS*. This should not be allowed because at least the latter is unquestionably a nomen nudum at that point.

10. I cannot see that the use of *Didus nazarenus* by Bartlett, either in *The Literary Gazette* (1851) or *PZS* (1854), is anything more than the identification of some bones supposedly from the island of Rodriguez with the name *Didus nazarenus* Gmelin, 1788, based on descriptions from an early Mascarene voyage. I certainly oppose placing the nonexistent name *Didus nazarenus* Bartlett, 1854 on an Official List over *Didus nazarenus* Gmelin, 1788, which latter name Schodde & Bock never mention or consider, although Bruce & McAllan at least refer to it.

11. In attempting to suppress *Somateria v-nigrum* G.R. Gray as of its appearance 1 December 1855 in *The Athenaeum*, Schodde & Bock fail to make any disposition of the earlier publication of this name for the same taxon by Bonaparte 22 October 1855 in a serial (*Comptes Rendus*) that certainly cannot be considered 'rare and inaccessible,' if that were really a consideration. The existence of Bonaparte's name was pointed out by Bruce & McAllan and was also known to Richmond (1992). That a name published by such a well-known author in such a prominent journal has remained overlooked is curious, but it is the earliest usage and involves no threat to current nomenclature.

12. Schodde & Bock engage in hyperbole in suggesting that the acceptance of names from the ancillary publications would 'displace a number of names in current use.' Of course, they do not specify the 'number', but it is actually very few. Out of the 54 suppressions they seek, 43 involve no change in existing nomenclature. Another six or so arise from obvious typographical errors that may be corrected (*Dendrochetia*, *ealconeri*), or easily comprehended variants in spelling that can be adopted without confusion, viz. *thibetanus* vs. *tibetanus*, *wallacei* vs. *wallacii*, *Aplornis*

vs. *Aplonis*, *Semeioptera* vs. *Semioptera*). The last two changes can be embraced on etymological grounds as well.

This leaves only two instances, out of this great farrago of potentially suppressed names, where existing nomenclature might change significantly, and one of these changes is not without its advantages.

Among Gould's many contributions to Australian ornithology was the description of the systematically important Noisy Scrub-bird. The first notice of this was in *The Athenaeum* for 27 January 1844 under the name *Atricha clamosa*. In Gould's *Birds of Australia* (1 March 1844) this species was again named as new, but as *Atrichia clamosa*, under which name it was recognized for 41 years, except for the mention by Sladen (1845), who used the first spelling, *Atricha*. When *Atrichia* Gould 1844 was found to be preoccupied by an insect, the name *Atrichornis* Stejneger, 1885 was substituted, and this still has currency. *Atricha*, however, is not preoccupied, and the publication of the name *Atricha clamosa* in *The Athenaeum* was prominently acknowledged nearly fifty years ago by Whitley (1938). It is curious that Bruce & McAllan do not cite Whitley, whereas Schodde & Bock do, although in an ambiguous manner not directly linked to the use of *Atricha*. That no one took up the use of *Atricha* from 1938 onward is inexplicable given that prominent authors were aware of it but ignored it while accepting names published in much more ephemeral sources (Bruce & McAllan, 1990, p. 459). *Atricha*, *Atrichia* and *Atrichornis* are all recognizably based on the same root and I do not consider that it would be overly confusing to revert to the earliest usage, thus bringing the attribution of the genus back to Gould where it rightly belongs. Why continue with a substitute name by a later author that must always be referred back to a preoccupied name, when an earlier and very similar name by the original author that is not preoccupied is available?

The only serious nomenclatural issue raised in the entire Bruce & McAllan paper is the ephemeral earlier use by Gould of the generic name *Pedionomus* for an utterly different bird from that to which it has been applied in all subsequent literature. Now this is an instance where suppression would be completely justified and here it is worth noting that Bruce & McAllan also supported suppression of 'the original publication of *Pedionomus* and *P. ocellatus* in *The Athenaeum*'. If these authors were unwilling to revive the earlier use of *Pedionomus*, then it seems unlikely that anyone else would, so the actual threat to stability of established nomenclature does not seem great. Nevertheless, if Schodde and Bock wish to go through the formality of specifically suppressing this first use of *Pedionomus*, there could be no reasonable grounds for opposition.

The rest of the application of Schodde & Bock, however, is too flawed, frivolous, expansive, and unnecessary to merit approval. Because it is so poorly researched and would have such undesirable effects as placing nomina nuda and nonexistent usages on the Official Lists, possibly along with other problems as yet unforeseen, it should be rejected in toto.

Additional references

- Archey, G. & R.S. Allan. 1954. On the type of '*Dinornis novae-zealandiae*' Owen, 1843 (Class Aves, Order Dinornithiformes). Pp. 224-225 in Opinion 229, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*, 4: 25-40.

- Brodkorb, P.** 1963. Catalogue of fossil birds, part 1 (Archaeopterygiformes through Ardeiformes). *Bulletin of the Florida State Museum, Biological Sciences*, 7: 179–293.
- Gould, J.** 1838. *Icones Avium*. Part II. Author, London.
- Olson, S.L.** 1990. [Review of] I.A.W. McAllan and M.D. Bruce 'The birds of New South Wales. A working list'. *Auk*, 107: 458–459.
- Richmond, C.W.** 1992. *The Richmond Index to the genera and species of birds*. 107 microfiches, guide of xi, 7 unnumbered pages. Hall & Company, Boston.
- Sladen, E.H.M.** 1845. Where should *Atricha clamosa* be placed in the system? *The Zoologist*, 3: 942.
- Wetmore, A.** 1965. Birds of the Republic of Panamá, part 1. *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, 150(4): 1–483.
- Wetmore, A.** 1968. Birds of the Republic of Panamá, part 2. *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*, 150(5): 1–605.

(2) Richard Schodde

*Australian National Wildlife Collection, CSIRO, Division of Wildlife and Ecology,
P.O. Box 84, Lyneham, A.C.T. 2602, Australia*

Walter J. Bock

*Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027,
U.S.A.*

We respond to Olson's comment to correct misrepresentations of background and to place in more balanced perspective his interpretations of the status of names published for John Gould and others in London periodicals: *The Analyst*, *The Athenaeum* and *The Literary Gazette*.

1. As recorded by Schodde & Bock (1997, Case 3044, para. 4), suppression of unused references for Gould's and others' names unearthed by Bruce & McAllan (1990) in London periodicals was canvassed at the round-table meeting of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Committee in Vienna in 1994. Both Bruce and McAllan were participants. The Committee and ancillary attendants voted for blanket suppression without dissent, and left Schodde and Bock to prepare the application. It is in that context — and that context alone — that the submission was prepared.

2. In espousing the principle that suppression should be restricted to names and works that pose a 'threat to comprehension and understanding in the zoological community', Olson stands in self-appointed judgement. As we understand it, the Commission is charged with adjudicatory powers for a rather different purpose: to make rulings that effect stability and universal acceptance in nomenclature (Article 79(a) of the Code). The 'gigantic subsidiary literature of suppressed names and works already created by the Commission' (Olson) is the necessary record of those rulings; and, despite their size, the resulting lists in the Commission's compendia are quickly and easily worked through by any zoologist with a knowledge of the alphabet, and the classes and families of animals. That our application (Case 3044) serves nomenclatural stability is explained in the original para. 3 (Schodde & Bock, 1997), and the principles in all of its clauses still stand. Its services to stability are also re-emphasised in paras. 4 and 8 below.

3. Paras. 2 and 3 in Olson's response concern the validity of descriptions in the London periodicals. It opens the way to charge and counter-charge which would produce little. Suffice to say that:

(i) none of the descriptions is more detailed or as well-referenced to source specimen material as their currently accepted equivalents in the scientific literature, e.g. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London (PZS)*;

(ii) most descriptions in the London periodicals are trivial and skimmed, and many do verge on *nomina nuda*. Thus, in comparison with the formal and carefully specified descriptions in the scientific journals, those of 25 of the 43 specific names are limited to one or two phrases, a number no better than 'four times larger', 'colouring still more gorgeous', 'lighter colouring of the breast and the redder hue of the crest', 'small size' and 'very small wings'. Another 13 are limited to one or two anecdotal sentences.

4. Although Olson claims to know the difference between *nomina nuda* and skimpy but validating diagnoses (second sentence of his para. 3), he is less sure in the next sentence and then in para. 9 prevaricates with 'absolute or virtual *nomina nuda*'. When abridged diagnoses in media reports become shortened to 'the smallest species' in its group or 'named....from the silky texture of the plumage', it becomes a matter of individual (and subjective) conjecture as to whether the names attached to them are available. In these circumstances, it seems better to err on the side of caution and ask the Commission to suppress names that may be subject to such argument. *Nyctidus pectoralis* Gould, 1837, with 'tarsi ... scarcely a quarter of an inch long', falls into this category, pace Olson (para. 8).

5. Olson's claim in his paras. 4 and 12 that the great majority of names to be suppressed involve 'no threat whatever to existing nomenclature' fails to comprehend that zoological nomenclature is more than just a name; it is the bibliographic and typification apparatus supporting the name as well, effecting connection between name and taxon. Relatively few of the names per se may change if our application fails, but all citations of original publication prevailing in 20th century ornithological literature will, and more than a few of the years of publication; in one case, *Anser serrirostris*, there would be a change in author as well. This will necessitate change to nomenclatural references in global, and particularly Australasian, checklists and handbooks that will, we maintain, be as unsettling as they are unnecessary. Already the first published volume of the current full Australian checklist (Schodde & Mason, 1997) has proceeded on the assumption that the names and their references in the London periodicals will be suppressed, following decision of the Vienna meeting of the SCON and application to the Commission by Schodde & Bock (1997) — see Article 80 of the Code. Involved are *Psephotus chrysopterygius* Gould and *Chrysococcyx minutillus* Gould; the former is gazetted by legislation as threatened fauna in Australia.

6. In paras. 5 to 10 of his response, Olson takes us to task for not doing our homework. In several cases, he is quite correct, and we are grateful for correction; in others, however, he would have been unaware that we had considered the issues and found them irrelevant, such as Bonaparte's involvement in *Somateria v-nigrum*. Here his own homework suffers from the very faults of which he so facetiously accuses others. Our reconsideration of such cases is detailed below and, for *Nyctidus pectoralis* Gould (Olson's para. 8), in our para. 4 above.

(i) In his para. 9, Olson points out that our submission made no mention of *Dinornis dromaeoides* Owen, 1843; we omitted it because it was the one name that was an absolute nomen nudum among those quoted in extracts from the London periodicals (Bruce & McAllan, 1990). Nevertheless we agree that for consistency it should have been included. Olson then proceeds to make his own contribution to the 'vexatious mess' involving the names of several moas. According to him, the only acceptable diagnosis of a *Dinornis* in *PZS* 1843: 144–146 is that for *D. giganteus*: 'largest tibia ... of two feet eleven inches'. Yet on the next line that for *D. struthoides* — 'smaller tibia, about two feet long when entire' — is no less adequate; and even 'smaller than the *Din. didiformis* ... and similarity of stature to the great Bustard (*Otis tarda*)' is arguably sufficient for *D. otidiformis*. Only *D. didiformis* in the *PZS* — described as third in decreasing size from *D. giganteus* — is probably a virtual nomen nudum (cf. Olson l.c.). Nevertheless, we agree with Olson that both *D. dromaeoides* Owen and *D. didiformis* Owen should have as their place of publication the *Transactions of the Zoological Society of London*. Not only is publication there consistent with Opinions 229 and 1874 but also entries in current basic references: Brodkorb (1963) and the New Zealand checklist (Checklist Committee, Ornithological Society of New Zealand, 1990). Retaining that source serves stability best, whatever the arguments about priority and availability. For the same reason, however, *giganteus* should date from its publication in the *PZS* as we recommended, following acceptance of that reference by the New Zealand checklist (l.c.; contra Olson).

(ii) We accept Olson's view (para. 10) that *Didus nazarenus* in Bartlett in *PZS* 1851: 284 is an application of *Didus nazarenus* Gmelin, 1788, however oblique the reference. Here the *Literary Gazette* (no. 1823: 923, 27 Dec. 1851) does service in making the connection clear.

(iii) Concerning *Somateria v-nigrum* Bonaparte, 1855, Olson's scorn for our research is better visited upon his own ineptitude. Bonaparte's oblique and anecdotal account, published on pp. 660–661 of vol. 41 of the *Comptes Rendus* (not p. 665 as stated by Bruce & McAllan, 1990), applies the briefest diagnosis — 'sous son menton la marque caractéristique de *Somateria spectabilis*' to 'un jeune oiseau, qui pouvait d'ailleurs être un hybride'. There is no explicit link between this or any other trait and the adults in the British Museum which Bonaparte, with G.R. Gray, named '*Somateria v-nigrum*'. The name there is thus a nomen nudum. Even if it were available, its authors would be Bonaparte and G.R. Gray jointly, revealing Olson's and Bruce & McAllan's research as particularly shoddy in this matter. So our original application in the matter of *S. v-nigrum* G.R. Gray should stand. Even though several modern references cite Bonaparte as author (e.g. Vaurie, 1965; Committee, American Ornithologists' Union, 1957; Cramp & Simmons, 1977), the most recent quote G.R. Gray in the *PZS* (Johnsgard, 1979; Sibley & Monroe, 1990).

(iv) Wetmore's (1968) acceptance of *The Zoologist* of April 1853 as the source for *Aulacoramphus caeruleogularis* Gould was followed by Haffer (1974) in his survey of the toucans. This decision should be allowed to stand.

7. Of the remaining names that Olson (paras. 5 and 7) claims have been taken up from the London periodicals or are available elsewhere, none except *Balaeniceps rex* Gould have been adopted in mainstream ornithological literature, not even *Aplornis* Gould (cf. Mathews, 1938). In attributing these and, indeed, all other newly available

names in the London periodicals to those sources, Olson would have us reject places and dates of publication long established in such basic references as the *Catalogue of Birds in the British Museum*, Peters' *Check-list of Birds of the World*, the current New Zealand and Australian checklists and Meyer de Schauensee's (1966) and Blake's (1977) treatises on South American and neotropical birds. The rhetoric is long, but the commonsense depressingly short. He would even (para. 12) replace *Atrichornis* Stejneger, 1885 for the Australian scrub-birds, a generic name that has been employed universally for this phylogenetically significant group throughout 20th century biological literature. It is a single-minded, blinkered application of priority confounding stability. If the periodical names are allowed to stand, what will be the reaction of handbooks, checklists and other references which cite source publications for names? We venture to suggest that some of the names will be accepted, others will be missed and still others avoided through uncertainty and mistrust of such trivial and frivolous publication. The potential for confusion and instability is patently obvious.

8. What is the solution, posed in Olson's (para. 6) question: how does one decide which has precedence? The solution, we maintain, lies in taking the course that disturbs stability least. The Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature also took this view at its Vienna 1994 meeting. This would be effected most simply and transparently by blanket suppression of all avian names cited by Bruce & McAllan (1990) as first published in the London periodicals except for those already brought into use (Schodde & Bock, 1997). Olson complains that 'poor' research may have overlooked other prior citations of names slated for suppression under para. 8(1) of Schodde & Bock (l.c.). He misses the point; such prior citations, if they exist, are so little known that they have not been brought into 20th century literature. Dredging them up simply muddies the waters further. Given the confusion surrounding the sources of the names in dispute here, well illustrated in Olson's para. 6, our application simply clears the decks. In effect, it extends the available name principle to firming up an already established set of accessible and well-documented source references for names that are usually well- and often widely-known and used.

9. Accordingly, we ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to accept our original application (Schodde & Bock, 1997), with the following amendments:

- (1) Add to 8(1)(a), suppression of generic names for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy, and to 8(6), placement on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology: *Marganetta* Gould, 4 December 1841, *The Literary Gazette*, no. 1298: 785. This name is validly published there (Article 12(b)(6) of the Code) and, without indication of misspelling, is senior to *Merganetta* Gould, March 1842;
- (2) Add to 8(2), placement on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology: *Merganetta* Gould, [March = 31 March] 1842, *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1841: 95 (gender: feminine), type species by monotypy: *Merganetta armata* Gould, 1842, *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1841: 95;
- (3) Delete all entries for *Didus nazaremus* Bartlett from 8(1)(d) and 8(4);

- (4) Add to 8(1)(d), suppression of specific names for both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy: *dromaeoides*, *Dinornis*, Owen, 2 December 1843, *The Literary Gazette*, no. 1402: 778–779;
- (5) Add to 8(4), placement on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology: *dromaeoides*, *Dinornis*, Owen, 1844, *Transactions of the Zoological Society of London*, 3(3): 253;
- (6) Replace in 8(4), placement on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, the date and source publication for *Dinornis didiformis* Owen with: 1844, *Transactions of the Zoological Society of London*, 3(3): 242;
- (7) Delete the entry for *Nyctidus pectoralis* Gould from 8(1)(c), suppression for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy, and from 8(8), placement on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology;
- (8) Add to 8(1)(d), suppression for both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy: *pectoralis*, *Nyctidus*, Gould, 18 November 1837, *The Athenaeum*, no. 525: 851;
- (9) Add to 8(4), placement on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology: *pectoralis*, *Nyctibius*, Gould, 1838, *Icones Avium*, II: pl. xviii, text;
- (10) Replace in 8(4), placement on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, the date and source publication for *Aulacorampus caeruleogularis* Gould with: [April] 1853, *The Zoologist*, 11: 3861.

Additional references

- Blake, E.R. 1977. *Manual of Neotropical Birds, Vol. 1 Spheniscidae (Penguins) to Laridae (Gulls and Allies)*. xlv, 674 pp. University of Chicago Press.
- Bonaparte, C.-L. 1855. 'Catalogue des genres et sous-genres d'oiseaux contenus dans le Muséum Britannique'. *Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences*, Paris, 41: 649–661.
- Checklist Committee, Ornithological Society of New Zealand. 1990. *Checklist of the birds of New Zealand and the Ross Dependency, Antarctica*. Ed. 3. Ornithological Society of New Zealand, Wellington.
- Checklist Committee, American Ornithologists' Union. 1957. *Check-list of North American birds*, Ed. 5. American Ornithologists' Union.
- Cramp, S. & Simmons, K.E.L. (Eds.). 1977. *Handbook of the birds of Europe the Middle East and North Africa. The birds of the Western Palearctic, Volume 1, Ostrich to Ducks*. 722 pp. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Haffer, J. 1974. Avian speciation in tropical South America, with a systematic survey of the toucans (Ramphastidae) and jacamars (Galbulidae). *Publications of the Nuttall Ornithological Club*, 14: i–viii, 1–390.
- Johnsgard, P.A. 1979. Order Anseriformes, pp. 425–506 In Mayr, E. & Cottrell, G.W. (Eds.). *Check-list of birds of the World*, Ed. 2, vol. 1. Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Mathews, G.M. 1938. *Aplornis* versus *Aplonis*. *Ibis*, (14)2: 342.
- Meyer de Schauensee, R. 1966. *The species of birds of South America and their distribution*. xvii, 577 pp. Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia.
- Schodde, R. & Mason, I.J. 1997. Aves (Columbidae to Coraciidae). In Houston, W.W.K. & Wells, A. (Eds.). *Zoological Catalogue of Australia*, vol. 37. xiii, 440 pp. CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne.
- Vaurie, C. 1965. *The birds of the Palearctic fauna. A systematic reference. Non-Passeriformes*. xx, 761 pp. Witherby, London.